

*Douglas v. VA*, 5 MSPR 280 (1981).

Any disciplinary action demands the exercise of responsible judgment so that an employee will not be penalized out of proportion to the character of the offense; this is particularly true of an employee who has a previous record of completely satisfactory service. An adverse action, such as a suspension, should be ordered only after a responsible determination that a less severe penalty, such as admonition or reprimand, is inadequate.

The Merit Systems Protection Board enumerated the factors that may be relevant to a determination of discipline in a particular case in *Douglas*, 5 MSPR at 305-06:

1. The nature and seriousness of the offense, and its relation to the employee's duties, position, and responsibilities, including whether the offense was intentional or technical or inadvertent, or was committed maliciously or for gain, or was frequently repeated;
2. the employee's job level and type of employment, including supervisory or fiduciary role, contacts with the public, and prominence of the position;
3. the employee's past disciplinary record;
4. the employee's past work record, including length of service, performance on the job, ability to get along with fellow workers, and dependability;
5. the effect of the offense upon the employee's ability to perform at a satisfactory level and its effect upon supervisors' confidence in the employee's ability to perform assigned duties;
6. consistency of the penalty with those imposed upon other employees for the same or similar offenses;
7. consistency of the penalty with the applicable agency table of penalties; [The Board mused in footnotes that these tables are not to be applied mechanically so that other factors are ignored. A penalty may be excessive in a particular case even if within the range permitted by statute or regulation. A penalty grossly exceeding that provided by an agency's standard table of penalties may for that reason alone be arbitrary and capricious, even though a table provides only suggested guidelines]
8. the notoriety of the offense or its impact upon the reputation of the agency;
9. the clarity with which the employee was on notice of any rules that were violated in committing the offense, or had been warned about the conduct in question;

10. potential for employee's rehabilitation;

11. mitigating circumstances surrounding the offense such as unusual job tensions, personality problems, mental impairment, harassment, or bad faith, malice or provocation on the part of others involved in the matter; and

12. the adequacy and effectiveness of alternative sanctions to deter such conduct in the future by the employee or others.